

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,815	11/19/2003		Willie Lau	A01269A	8043
21898	7590 12/30/2005			EXAMINER	
ROHM AN		COMPANY	MULLIS, J	EFFREY C	
		E MALL WEST	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELI	PHIA, PA	19106-2399	1711		

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/716,815	LAU ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711		
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some year of the maximum statutory period for reply will, by some year of the maximum statutory period by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI tatute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. lly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	21 October 2005.			
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the applica	tion.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to by	y the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	,	, ,		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:		119(a)-(d) or (f).		
1. Certified copies of the priority docum				
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	·			
 Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu 	•	eceived in this National Stage		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a		eceived		
	not of the dorange dopies her to			
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Su			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE 	, – –	Mail Date Dimal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	•		

Application/Control Number: 10/716,815

Art Unit: 1711

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,419. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the process steps recited by the product claims of the patent encompasses those of the instant claims.

It is noted that the instant claims are broader in a number of aspects than those of the parent case as they stood as of the requirement for restriction in the parent case since no degree of polymerization or cooling is recited by the instant application claims. The above obviousness type double patenting rejection is therefore not precluded.

The terminal disclaimer filed on 10-21-05 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US 6,670,419 has been reviewed and is NOT accepted.

Art Unit: 1711

An attorney or agent, not of record, is not authorized to sign a terminal disclaimer in the capacity as an attorney or agent acting in a representative capacity as provided by 37 CFR 1.34 (a). See 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c).

JCM

3-6-05

Jeffrey Mullis Primary Examiner Art Unit 1711